

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets, which include Figures 1-4, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-4. The replacement sheets are the original drawing sheets and include no changes.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action mailed October 9, 2007, Applicant amends his application and requests reconsideration. In this Amendment, no claims are canceled and new claim 5 is added so that claims 1-5 are now pending.

The drawings were objected to for reasons that are not entirely understood. All of the comments in the Office Action are directed to issues not applicable to the drawings in the present patent application. It appears from the PAIR system that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may have defaced the drawings originally filed. Accordingly, a substitute set of drawings is attached. There is no difference between the content of these drawings and the drawings originally filed.

Applicant brings to the Examiner's attention his co-pending, simultaneously filed and assigned U.S. patent applications 10/735,812 and 10/735,814, both being examined by Examiner Hsu in Art Unit 3714. Simultaneously filed with this Response is an Information Disclosure Statement citing the publications currently applied in rejecting the claims of the other two patent applications. The Examiner is invited to consider all of the publications cited in the other two applications that have not been cited in the prosecution of the present patent application.

In this Amendment all claims are amended for clarity. The present patent application is directed to an integrated service payment system for a hotel that includes a casino. In that system, a house card is issued to a user of the hotel and casino services. The house card identifies the user. Further, the house card may be used to purchase both hotel services and casino services. The system includes a server that interacts with the house card to maintain a running total of any casino deposit. An initial deposit to the account of the user may be divided into a casino deposit and a reserve deposit that is generally used for hotel services. See the description at page 13 of the patent application.

Further, the payment system ensures that casino services are controlled so that there are no losses due to continuing purchases of casino services when the casino deposit has reached zero. The system also ensures that a user on a winning streak is limited in the amount of money that can be won. This usage restriction is imposed by

limiting use of the card, i.e., imposing a usage restriction on casino services, when the amount of the casino deposit accumulated over time exceeds an established upper limit. See the description in the patent application from 13, line 21 through page 14, line 11.


New claim 5 depends from claim 1 and is derived from original claim 4, expressly stating that use of the casino services is restricted when the casino balance reaches zero. This situation is distinct from the arrangement described in claim 2, which may apply when a casino deposit has not yet been established.

Claims 1-4 were rejected as anticipated by Rowe (published U.S. patent application 2002/002075). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While a lengthy discussion of the prior art rejection could be provided, it is apparent that the rejection is moot in view of the claims now presented. In rejecting claims 2 and 4, the Examiner directed attention to paragraph [0080] of Rowe. That paragraph is apparently the only passage of Rowe that describes any kind of usage restriction of the Rowe system. That restriction limits usage of casino services once the balance reaches zero, unless there is an overdraft feature. Neither that paragraph nor any other part of Rowe describes the usage restriction appearing in amended independent claims 1 and 3 in which usage of casino services is restricted when the balance due to casino winnings exceeds some upper limit. Thus, Rowe cannot anticipate, much less suggest, any claim now pending.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5 are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Jeffrey A. Wyand, Reg. No. 29,458
LEYDIE, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: December 27, 2007
JAW/jj